

**CITY OF MORGAN HILL  
JOINT REGULAR REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
AND SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 22, 2006**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman/Mayor Kennedy called the special meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE**

Present: Agency/Council Members Carr, Grzan, Sellers, Tate and Chairperson/Mayor Kennedy

**DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA**

Agency Secretary/City Clerk Torrez certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code 54954.2.

**SILENT INVOCATION**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**PROCLAMATIONS**

Mayor Kennedy presented the Future Business Leaders of America Week proclamation to Live Oak High School Students, Elaine Liu and Tiffany Shuyan. These students presented a report on the activities/services the Live Oak High School Business Leaders have been involved with throughout the years.

**CITY COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Council Member Tate indicated that the Financial Policy & Legal Affairs Committee met this afternoon. This Committee is overseeing the Community Conversation; indicating that this process is going extremely well. He indicated that the Committee discussed some of the follow-up activities that need to take place. The Committee would like to return to the Council with a report requesting direction. The Committee is recommending a Capstone event be held on April 29, 2006 and that additional services may add a little to the consultant's contract. The Committee would also like to bring back to the Council the second survey to be performed; verifying the Council still wants to proceed with a second survey.

**OTHER REPORTS**

None.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman/Mayor Kennedy opened the floor to public comments for items not appearing on this evening's agenda.

Carol O'Hare, President of the Friends of the Library, invited the Council to the Library groundbreaking ceremony to be held on Saturday, April 15, 2 p.m. She said that everyone in the community is invited to this ground breaking ceremony, and requested that individuals bring shovels to help with the groundbreaking ceremony.

Dana Kellogg expressed concern with the safety issue associated with grocery carts being left on streets, properties adjacent to sidewalks, and sidewalks as children tend to use them as toys. He requested a better understanding of what the City can do to eliminate this safety concern.

No further comments were offered.

City Manager Tewes responded to the shopping cart concern. He indicated that staff has been working with the supermarkets and other stores who have shopping carts to try to ensure that they have regular patrols to pick up the shopping carts. He stated that carts are not always picked up on a timely basis. Therefore, there are some places in town where shopping carts are left. He acknowledged that abandoned shopping carts can be a nuisance and that staff has to redouble its efforts to work with the merchants. He indicated that the City does not have a city-financed shopping cart abatement program. He said that a couple of years ago, state legislators determined this was of a state-wide significance and that local cities could not adopt shopping cart ordinances unless they met certain state-wide standards. He indicated that staff will be researching these standards and providing the information to Mr. Kellogg and the Council, should it wish to pursue this matter in the future.

Mayor Pro Tempore Grzan and Mayor Kennedy welcomed City Attorney Janet Kern to the Council meeting and the City of Morgan Hill.

## ***Redevelopment Agency Action***

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

**Action:**        *On a motion by Agency Member Tate and seconded by Agency Member Sellers, the Agency Board unanimously (5-0) **Approved** Consent Calendar Item 1 as follows:*

1.        **JANUARY 2006 FINANCE & INVESTMENT REPORT - RDA**  
          **Action: Accepted and Filed** Report

## ***City Council Action***

### **CONSENT CALENDAR:**

Mayor Kennedy indicated that it was his understanding that item 4 needs to be removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

City Manager Tewes recommended that item 7 remain on consent. He indicated that staff has provided the Council with the resolution described in the staff report, but not made available until this evening.

**Action:**        *On a motion by Council Member Tate and seconded by Council Member Sellers, the City Council unanimously (5-0) **Approved** Consent Calendar Items 2, 3, 5-8, as follows:*

2.        **JANUARY 2006 FINANCE & INVESTMENT REPORT - CITY**

**Action:** **Accepted** and **Filed** Report

3.        **MID-YEAR UPDATE - 2005/2006 WORKPLAN**

**Action:** **Accepted** Report.

5.        **RESIGNATION OF A LIBRARY, CULTURE & ARTS COMMISSIONER**

**Action:** 1) **Accepted** Jeanne Gregg's Resignation from the Library, Culture and Arts Commission; and 2) **Directed** the City Clerk to Commence Recruitment Efforts to Fill the Vacancy Concurrently with Upcoming Recruitment Efforts.

6.        **ACCEPTANCE OF SUBDIVISION IMPROVEMENTS FOR TRACT 9567, COYOTE ESTATES PHASE VIII**

**Action:** 1) **Adopted** Resolution No. 5977, Accepting the Subdivision Improvements Included in Tract 9567, Commonly Known as Coyote Estates Phase VIII; and 2) **Directed** the City Clerk to File a Notice of Completion with the County Recorder's Office.

7.        **CONDITIONAL VACATION OF A PORTION OF A PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ON APN: 728-37-002 AND APN: 728-37-004**

**Action:** 1) **Adopted** Resolution No. 5978, as Presented at the Meeting, Declaring Summary Vacation of a Portion of a Public Utility Easement on APN: 728-37-002 and 728-37-004; and 2) **Directed** the City Clerk to File a Certified Copy of the Resolution with the Santa Clara County Recorder Upon Relocation of the Sewer Main and Granting of the New Public Utility Easement.

8.        **JOINT CITY COUNCIL REGULAR AND SPECIAL REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING MINUTES**

**Action:** **Approved** as Submitted.

4.        **SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING TO BE SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 29, 2006**  
*29, 2006 for Community Development Department Items.*

City Manager Tewes indicated that this item has been brought before the Council because of the complexity and the likelihood the City might have a crowd for 17 different annexations being pursued under the “Island Annexation Provisions.” He stated that staff has been working with the Local Agency Formation Commission under a state law that expires soon. Should the City proceed with these annexations, the City must stay on a rigorous time schedule. He clarified that there are 17 different proposals that involve a number of property owners. He stated that staff expects a full house when the Council addresses the annexations. Staff believes it would be appropriate to have a separate meeting in order to provide time to focus on these issues. Staff is proposing that the Council reserve March 29, 2006 as a special meeting date to consider the annexations. He indicated the Council has an interest in other meetings throughout the month, and felt that it might be appropriate to talk about these meeting dates as well.

Council Member Sellers indicated that he does not anticipate being available on March 29 as it was an open date. He understands this is an issue the Council will need to address; noting that the Council will be shorthanded most of the month of March. He inquired whether the timeline precludes the Council from holding the annexation hearings earlier.

City Manager Tewes said that this item could be considered earlier or a week or two later; recognizing that there may be many contentious business items before the Council.

Council Member Sellers suggested that April 12 be a meeting date to be considered.

Council Member Tate stated his preference to an April 12 special meeting date.

**Action:** *On a motion by Council Member Sellers and seconded by Council Member Tate, the City Council unanimously (5-0) **Agreed** to Hold a Special City Council Meeting on April 12, 2006 to discuss the items described by the City Manager.*

## ***City Council Action***

### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

#### **9. DEVELOP CITY COUNCIL POSITION REGARDING PROPOSED VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) QUARTER-CENT SALES TAX TO SUPPORT LONG-TERM TRANSIT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CIP) EXPENDITURE PLAN**

Deputy Director of Public Works Bjarke presented the staff report, indicating that the Council is being asked to consider VTA’s proposed ¼ cent sales tax and associated expenditure plan; primarily for Measure A programs. He stated that there are two action items before the Council: 1) take a position in support or none support of the proposed ¼ cent sales tax; and 2) provide direction to the Council’s VTA Board representative who will be representing the City at the March 2, 2006 VTA meeting. He noted that this item was continued from the Council’s meeting of January 25, 2006 based on the fact that there was general consensus that there were some questions left unanswered, and that the VTA Board decided

to defer acting on this item until March 2. Therefore, the Council deferred this item to this evening. Since the January 25, 2006 meeting, a letter was sent, dated January 31, 2006 signed by the Mayor to the VTA Board of Directors, seeking clarification on the issues/questions raised by the Council. He informed the Council that the City did not receive a formal response from the VTA Board of Directors. VTA staff has been trying to answer some of the questions through e-mails included in the Council packet, as well as additional data. He indicated that Jim Lawson, VTA Government Affairs Office, was in attendance to answer questions the Council may have. He indicated that the Council was recently notified that the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors is contemplating a ½ cent general sales tax measure. He summarized VTA's proposed ¼ cent sales tax by stating that this would be a 30-year ¼ cent sales tax that would supplement the 2000 Measure A Transit Program. He indicated that the added sales tax revenue would allow the entire Measure A program to be completed with reserves. He identified four items that are new and dependent on the ¼ cent sales tax proposal: bus rapid transit; senior-disabled program; a BART operating subsidy; and \$717 million for local streets, county expressways and bicycle projects. Projects proposed for South County: Caltrain improvements that include 8.4 miles of double tracking to be completed by 2010 (included in the original Measure program); Caltrain electrification; bus rapid transit; 24% increase in bus and rail service; senior-disabled program; bicycle and pedestrian program, and pavement projects (\$122,000 per year for Morgan Hill). He said that the County Expressway fund is an item included in the plan.

Council Member Tate inquired as to the level of commitments to these projects. (What will VTA commit to in writing to South County?)

Mayor Kennedy indicated that he spoke to VTA's general manager on this question today. The response was that it would be up to the VTA Board to determine whether they want to add specific language. As the Council's VTA Board representative, he would push to include the language requested by the Council. However, he noted that it would take a VTA Board to include a commitment to South County. He noted that South County does not have expressways, and that it was suggested that VTA identify Monterey Road, Santa Teresa, and Butterfield Boulevard as South County's equivalent to expressways; asking that this language be included. He stated that he would base his support conditionally, upon language being included in the VTA Board's action.

Mr. Bjarke informed the Council of significant upcoming meeting dates: Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors to meet on February 28 to consider the proposed ½ cent sales tax for a June 6, 2006 ballot measure; and VTA Board of Directors to consider the ¼ cent sales plan and expenditure plan on March 2. He referred the Council to the pages in the agenda packet that addresses the Council's questions.

Mayor Kennedy indicated that he distributed a memorandum to the Council and staff as to his recommendations for Council action. He stated that dialog and discussions are occurring at the City level as well as at the County level; including Supervisor Don Gage in discussions regarding the proposed VTA scenario and the ¼ cent sales tax proposal. He recommended the Council grant him latitude to negotiate to achieve the Council's desired goals as the City's VTA Board representative. He suggested the following goals: 1) Morgan Hill's position should be one that requires VTA Board language to state that both BART and Caltrain proceed; one not proceeding without the other. He felt that Caltrain has an equal priority to BART. He recommended the City push for a position that Caltrain

has equal priority to BART. If BART starts to use up all of the funds, it is not to be at the expense of Caltrain. 2) Any support of the VTA transit capital improvement program is depended upon the Board including language that supports the projects Morgan Hill has identified (e.g., identify Monterey Road and Santa Teresa Boulevard as major arterials for funding comparable to other county expressways; community busing; expanded bus service; expanded Caltrain service, including double tracking. He noted the words “double tracking” were included in the original Measure A language). 3) Consider support for a county-wide ½ cent sales tax only if it includes provisions for general services that meets the needs of cities and VTA; meeting councils and County goals. If a pavement management funding program is considered, the City does not want to use the 1996 Measure B formula because it unfairly penalizes cities that have had a higher population growth rate. Therefore, he recommended a formula be used that is based upon more recent population numbers.

Mayor Kennedy opened the floor to public comment. No comments were offered.

Mayor Pro Tempore Grzan said that he was intrigued by the County’s proposal for a similar measure. He noted that the County’s proposal has a ⅓-⅓-⅓ split going to cities, VTA and the County.

City Manager Tewes said that there was a proposal approximately a year ago that would propose a 1/3 split that received support from the Morgan Hill City Council, but not much support elsewhere in the county. In the meantime, the County Board of Supervisors have been advised by County Counsel that Proposition 218 has significantly changed the way in which one can proceed with taxes. To proceed with a tax would require a majority vote for a general tax to be used for any general county purpose. Therefore, the County could not earmark, in any percentages, the funds for VTA or cities. He stated that it was his understanding that on Tuesday, February 28, the County Board of Supervisors will consider whether or not to place a general tax on the ballot. As a general tax, the Board might indicate a full range of responsibilities the County has that could include regional transportation issues as well as support to cities. However, the County Board of Supervisors cannot specify the specific proportion of revenues to be earmarked to these projects.

Council Member Sellers felt the County’s proposal for a shared tax was a good idea. He said that he had the opportunity to have discussions with several County Board of Supervisors over the last week or so who have indicated that the proposal would be a general tax. If the County decides to move forward with a tax measure, it would be the County who would be in charge of the tax dollars. There is a concern that even though the County Board of Supervisors may have latitude to make the linkage between the types of projects to be funded, he senses reluctance by the Board to call for anything more specific than the County indicating they would provide services; indicating that they have a \$111 million annual shortfall. Therefore, they need these additional funds. It was his belief that this would be the gist of what the County will move forward with. There may be several individuals involved who will be hopeful that some of the funds will go to non profit organizations and community/transportation activities.

Council Member Sellers stated that he did not receive the information distributed earlier this evening. He commented on some of the goals as outlined by Mayor Kennedy. He referred to the first goal that both Caltrain and BART proceed. He did not know what in Caltrain would proceed and recommended

this statement be clarified. He said that there are funds in place to proceed with double tracking in 2010 in a way that would allow expanded services to meet the needs for the long term. He would support adding two tracks north and south of Morgan Hill that would allow the trains to significantly expand. He felt that making the linkage between VTA and the County's ½ cent sales tax to be premature or presumptuous, on the City's part, as the County has not indicated that these funds would go to VTA. He was not sure that meeting the needs of the cities and VTA meets the Council's transit goals, or whether they were a broader council goal; noting that this is a general tax. He stated that it was stated that the County has a variety of programs the City is associated with. He requested clarification of this statement.

Jim Lawson, VTA Government Affairs Office, stated that the Board of Supervisors heard the same information from County Counsel that the VTA Board heard from their general counsel. The information is what has been relayed by Mayor Kennedy, City Manager Tewes and Council Member Sellers. He said that any tax the County desires to put forward needs to be used for general county purposes, and cannot be linked to anything else. He said that this would become problematic for the County and VTA. Should the County decide to place a tax measure on the ballot in June or November 2006, someone will be attending the Council's meeting requesting Council support. The same would occur in terms of the VTA. He stated that the VTA Board has the ability to place measures on the ballot to be used for VTA's special district and would require a 2/3 vote for transit and highway related purposes. He agreed this is an extremely fluid situation. He suggested the Council give its VTA Board representative the maximum amount of flexibility in this fluid situation.

Council Member Carr referred to page 129 of the agenda packet, the e-mail from Mr. Lawson to Mr. Bjarke. He noted the e-mail identifies the new projects added to the expenditure plan. He inquired whether these were new projects in addition to the Measure A projects.

Mr. Lawson stated that these would be the projects the Board of Directors and associated cities felt were important to add. The pavement management program was one that was sensitive and successful in the prior measure. He indicated that the BART operating subsidy is in addition to what was included in Measure A.

Council Member Carr referred to page 133, the VTA Board memorandum dated December 23, 2005. He read from page 2 of 7, the last paragraph that reads as follows: The immediate results of using the new sales tax data is that all Measure A projects can be completed as initial projects, subject to a proposed ¼ cent sales tax passing in 2006. In reading this sentence, he felt the statement to mean that VTA stipulates that the Measure A projects cannot be completed under the existing funding mechanism.

Mr. Lawson clarified that under the existing funding mechanism, VTA is incapable of providing all of the Measure A projects. It is also incapable of maintaining the level of service it currently has.

Council Member Carr said that he is having difficulty in looking at a new 30-year plan and a new funding plan without knowing how far VTA would get with what has already been promised to taxpayers. He felt that what needs to be gagged is what wouldn't get done in order to decide whether a new funding source and new funding plan is necessary to finish the Measure A projects.

Mr. Lawson said that at the VTA Board workshop, the Board asked for two scenarios to be presented without the additional ¼ cent sales tax (e.g., new projects, no new projects). In both instances, the numbers become substantially negative numbers (e.g., \$3 billion and \$4 billion). The decision as to which of these projects do not get completed is a decision the VTA Board will need to make. He stated that the Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee recommended that a new source of revenue was necessary 2-3 years ago. He clarified that some projects have moved to the completion plan that means there is no funding for the projects, yet; and that the balance is extremely negative. He stated that staff is not in a position to state which projects would be completed.

Council Member Carr referred to page 4 of 7, the summary of the projects and timeline being recommended in VTA Scenario #1. He inquired whether this was a City of San Jose recommendation, and not necessarily what VTA staff or the Board have adopted.

Mr. Lawson indicated that the italicized version is staff's response to the City's request. He clarified that the recommended VTA scenario is the 30-year expenditure plan that includes a new revenue source being discussed this evening. He clarified that the completion program would be those projects for which adequate funding had been identified, over the course of the project. These would be the initial projects, and that a completion column was established for those projects that did not have funding identified. He clarified that this does not refer to the measure language, but refers to the initial programs for those that could be funded. The completion programs were those projects looking for funding.

Council Member Tate felt that Mayor Kennedy's suggested goal #1 was on target. He agreed that the Council does not have a specific item to point to as a tax measure. He further agreed that there is some benefit to South County for BART, but this is not enough to justify supporting the additional tax, in whatever form it may take. Until the City receives commitments from VTA in writing as to how they would include other South County and Morgan Hill projects, he could not support being in favor of whatever tax measure comes before the Council.

Mayor Kennedy indicated that the VTA Board will act on the statement contained in the December 23 memo from the VTA Board of directors from Michael Burns and Jack Collins. The memo recommends adoption of the VTA 2000 Measure A Transit Program with a revenue expenditure plan that assumes a new ¼ cent sales tax; supporting the construction and operation of the 2000 Measure A projects and some new projects and programming. He clarified that the intent of the first item in his written submittal is that there is a group of north and south County cities for which Caltrain is an important issue; equally important to BART. He said that the language is stated in a manner that would gain support and maintain support from cities to the north as well. He stated that there are 12 members on the VTA Board who are equally divided between those who are strong supporters of BART and those in strong support of Caltrain. He said that his comment reflects the vision of the VTA Board. However, he understands that Council Member Tate would like to make sure that Morgan Hill-South County projects proceed. He noted that this goal is included in the second comment.

Council Member Tate indicated that he would like to see the complete list of South County projects with commitments identified. He would give some credit to BART, but not if it receives first priority should



funding run out and other projects do not move forward. He recommended that this complete list be included under the second goal.

Mayor Kennedy stated that he has been meeting on this issue up to the last minute. He indicated that he spent several hours meeting with Council Member Greg Perry, City of Mountain View, last Wednesday. He informed the Council that Council Member Perry has serious concerns about the capacity to deliver all of the projects under the VTA scenario. He said that he respects Council Member Perry's analysis and thoroughness in preparing his position. It is Council Member Perry's conclusion that the bonding capability will not allow the VTA scenario to proceed unless BART takes up all of the monies while other projects suffer. He indicated that this discussion is ongoing. He will be meeting with Supervisor Gage to discuss his position. He said that as a VTA Board Member, he would be representing Morgan Hill, Gilroy and Milpitas. He noted that Milpitas would benefit greatly from BART, while South County would benefit from Caltrain. He stated that he received a letter from the Mayor of Milpitas requesting support of their position (in support of the VTA scenario). He noted that Mayor Pinhero, City of Gilroy, has offered a counter position; indicating that the Gilroy City Council is not supportive of a ¼ cent sales tax. He acknowledged that this is an extremely complex question and apologized for the late submittal of his report as he has been working on his report to the very last minute before presenting it to the Council.

Council Member Sellers said that given the fluidity of the situation, and the fact the Council would be meeting next Wednesday, he would like to hear more about the best way to proceed; given the fact that the ½ cent sales tax issue is being considered. He noted there is no direct tie or commitment associated with the ½ cent sales tax to the city. He recommended the Council request a report back from the City's representative to the VTA Board on March 1, 2006 with his thought on what he plans on doing on March 2. The Council can weigh in on the decision before the VTA Board meeting.

**Action:** *Council Member Sellers made a motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tempore Grzan, to **request** the City's VTA Board representative to give a report at the March 1, 2006 Council meeting with any action being deferred until after the report is given.*

Mayor Kennedy felt there would be a lot of discussion by board members on what their cities want, and that there may be some opportunity for "give and take" at the March 2 VTA Board meeting. Therefore, it is important for him to know what are the highest priorities for the Council. He said that he has heard that it is the City's previous list sent to the VTA Board that needs to be more inclusive.

Council Member Sellers concurred that the previous list is needed; and that it would be important to know where the issue is as far as the decision making process. He recommended the Council focus on this scenario. He wanted to know VTA's inclination at the Council's March 1 meeting.

Mayor Kennedy said that if Council Member Perry's position is correct in that bonding will severely limit the number of projects that can move forward, and that projects need to fall off the list, he inquired as to the City's highest priority. It was his understanding that the Council supports the prior list; noting that BART was not included in the list. He felt there is an unwritten message he is receiving that BART is not the top priority, and inquired whether the other projects were of top priority.

Council Member Carr felt that the 2000 Measure A projects should be the priority projects as the voters were promised a package of goods when they voted to approve these projects. He felt it incumbent upon the VTA Board to make these projects a commitment; completing these projects. If there is not enough money in the Measure A tax, the new revenue source should go toward completing the Measure A programs. It may be that the VTA Board will need some latitude to make some changes because some of the projects may no longer make sense. However, it was his belief the City should focus on Measure A projects before talking about new projects or new timelines. It was his understanding that the new program would step up the timeline for completing projects, including BART, by adding new revenue sources. Unless the rest of the Measure A programs are also identified as being completed, he did not believe that monies should be spent to move up projects at the expense of Measure A projects. He recommended that this be a priority of the Council. He would like to talk about South County goals; including Morgan Hill goals. If there are items the Council specifically wants for Morgan Hill that are not included in the memo, he recommended they be included. He felt the Council needs to talk about South County goals as this is the only way the City has some leverage with the ability to bring on board the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. He felt this was the only means of having a South County perspective on this issue.

Mayor Kennedy noted that Mr. Lawson stated that if a ¼ cent sales tax is not included, the new projects would go away. Also, the projects included in Measure A would not be completed.

Council Member Carr reiterated that focus should be given to finding revenue to complete the original programs before thinking about other projects.

Council Member Tate concurred with Council Member Carr's comment that projects identified with the original Measure A program should not be dropped, especially moving up BART or any other projects.

Mayor Kennedy did not believe it is a question of moving up the BART project, but a question of delaying the completion of BART. It was his belief that the VTA scenario includes a BART completion of 2016.

Mr. Lawson said that the current version of the scenario has BART being completed in 2016. Because of the magnitude of the BART project, when you move it back, the cost of inflation tends to eliminate the advantages that might be achieved by postponing it. He said that one of the reasons the last scenario worked was due to the fact that BART was moved forward.

Mayor Pro Tempore Grzan noted that there are other organizations that will be proposing taxes as well (e.g., County, School District, and the City). He expressed concern that the voters will be facing several tax measures at the same time and may reject all measures. He was not sure whether he could support one or all possible tax measures that may come forward. He said that he is having difficulty in looking at this tax measure without looking at all other tax measures; particularly the needs of Morgan Hill. He noted that the City's need to support core services outweigh transportation issues. If he had to support a tax, it would be the one that would generate the most funds for Morgan Hill to avoid some of the serious decisions that will need to be made down the road.

Mayor Kennedy said that the proposed county-wide ½ cent sales tax, if it includes funding for cities, VTA and the County, could fulfill Mayor Pro Tempore Grzan's objectives with just one single tax and reduce some of the voter confusion and overlap.

**Vote:**            *The motion carried unanimously (5-0).*

### **FUTURE COUNCIL-INITIATED AGENDA ITEMS**

No items were identified.

### ***Redevelopment Agency and City Council Action***

### **CLOSED SESSIONS:**

City Attorney/Agency Counsel Kern announced the below listed closed session item.

<b>1.</b>	
<b><u>PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION</u></b>	
Authority	Government Code 54957
Public Employee Performance Evaluation:	City Manager
Attendees:	City Council, City Manager

### **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman/Mayor Kennedy opened the Closed Session items to public comment. No comments were offered.

### **ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION**

Chairman/Mayor Kennedy adjourned the meeting to Closed Session at 8:12 p.m.

### **RECONVENE**

Chairman/Mayor Kennedy reconvened the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

### **CLOSED SESSION ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mayor/Chairman Kennedy announced that no reportable action was taken in closed session.

---

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman/Mayor Kennedy adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

**MINUTES RECORDED AND PREPARED BY:**

---

**IRMA TORREZ, AGENCY SECRETARY/CITY CLERK**